PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

NTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXA	MINING AUTHORIT	r 	PCI
To:			
ELZABURU, Alberto, de Miguel Angel, 21 28010 Madrid		WRITTEN OPINION (PCT Rule 66)	
2385300 - 06/06/2005	1 22 4 1 2		
		Date of mailing (day/month/year)	31/05/2005
Applicant s or agent's rile reference PCT-149	·		within 2 / 00 months/days
International application No.	International filing date	e (day month year)	Priority date (day/month/year)
PCT/EP03/13828	28/11/2003		10/10/2003
International Patent Classification (IPC) or	both national classificati	ion and IPC	
	A23L1/30		
Applicant	EC DATEARC		•
UNIVERSITAT DE LES ILL	ES BALEARS		
This opinion contains indications relating I	-		ndustrial applicability
IV Lack of unity of invention V X Reasoned statement under citations and explanations s			e step or industrial applicability;
VI Certain documents cited			
VII Certain defects in the intern	national application		·
VIII Certain observations on the	e international applicatio	on	
3. The applicant is hereby invited to reply when? See the time limit indicated at to grant an extension, see Ru How? By submitting a written reply For the form and the language	bove. The applicant may, le 66.2(d). , accompanied, where ap	ppropriate, by amendme	of that time limit, request this Authority ents, according to Rule 66.3.
Also For an additional opportunity For the examiner's obligation For an informal communicati	to consider amendment	s and/or arguments, see	Rule 66.4 <i>bis</i> .
If no reply is filed, the international pro-	eliminary examination re	eport will be established	on the basis of this opinion.
The final date by which the international examination report must be established		s: <u>10/02</u>	./2006 . Sisches Patentam
Name and mailing address of the IPEA/		Authorized officer	4300
		1	
European Patent Office, P.B. 58 NL-2280 HV Rijswijk - Netherl		Examiner	te limits) & Solution of the limits of the limits) & Solution of the limits of t



WRITTEN OPINION

International application No.

PCT/EP03/13828

- I. Basis of the opinion
- 1. The basis of this written opinion is the application as originally filed.
- Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability
- 1. In light of the documents cited in the international search report, it is considered that the invention as defined in at least some of the claims does not appear to meet the criteria mentioned in Article 33(1) PCT, i.e. does not appear to be novel and/or to involve an inventive step (see international search report, in particular the documents cited X and/or Y and corresponding claims references).
- 2. If amendments are filed, the applicant should comply with the requirements of Rule 66.8 PCT and indicate the basis of the amendments in the documents of the application as originally filed (Article 34 (2) (b) PCT) otherwise these amendments may not be taken into consideration for the establishment of the international preliminary examination report. The attention of the applicant is drawn to the fact that if the application contains an unnecessary plurality of independent claims, no examination of any of the claims will be carried out.
- NB: Should the applicant decide to request detailed substantive examination, then an international preliminary examination report will normally be established directly. Exceptionally the examiner may draw up a second written opinion, should this be explicitly requested.